

THE
AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY
TO THE
CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

The Plan of Agreement between the two American Tract Societies having been abruptly abrogated by the Boston Society, the Executive Committee of the New York Society referred the matter to the five members of the original Committee of Conference on the part of that Society, "to prepare and issue such a statement of the whole subject as they shall judge the best interest of this Society requires."

That Plan of Agreement is as follows:

1. "That the Society at Boston withdraw all its agents from the field; discontinue all personal or other appeals for funds, either to churches or ecclesiastical bodies, in New England or elsewhere; and that its existence be continued distinctively as a Publishing Corporation. But that it may carry out fully the designs of its founders and past benefactors, it is to retain the right to receive the voluntary offerings of churches and individuals, and to distribute its publications by grants, as Providence may open the way.

2. "That the Society at New York occupy the field thus relinquished; discontinue its Depository in Boston; and transfer the sale and agency of its book and tract publications there to the Society at Boston; and the Society at Bos-

ton transfer the sale and agency of its book and tract publications in New York to the Society there.

3. "That both Societies exercise each toward the other the highest courtesy of the Book Trade in the matter of republication; and that neither be compelled to keep or sell any book or tract which its own Committee of Publication does not approve.

4. "That the action herein proposed be consummated not later than May, 1868.

5. "That if any future matter of difference arise between the two Societies, it be referred to a Committee of two from each Society, to be appointed by its Executive Committee, said Committee of four to have power to appoint a fifth member."

The Boston Society have rescinded this agreement, in consequence of a statement laid before them by their Executive Committee, that the New York Society had been guilty of bad faith in not making the promised "transfer of sale and agency." This Statement has been published, and does us and the public grievous wrong, both by what it suppresses, and what it charges. It suppresses the historical fact, fundamental to all right conceptions of the carrying out of the Plan, that the two Committees had unanimously agreed upon a certain method of effecting this "transfer of sale and agency;" and then, arguing from these words in the agreement as if no meaning had been affixed to them by concurrent and unanimous action, the authors of that Statement make the most serious charges against the good faith and honor of the Society at New York. The revelation of this fact alone, empties their Statement of all force, and we might content ourselves with this simple vindication. But we

prefer to answer the charges made against us as if the fact suppressed did not exist, and then present the facts in the case as they actually occurred.

COMMITTEE OF ARBITRATION.

But first, we call attention to the fifth article in this Plan of Agreement, which was inserted to provide "an easy and effectual solution of any difficulty which might arise," and thus guard against the necessity of a public discussion. Both Societies were under the most sacred obligation to seek redress for any supposed grievance by a resort to this Committee of Arbitration. The interests of the common cause in which we were engaged, the claims of Christian courtesy, and the express provisions for a suitable Court of Arbitration, should have restrained the Boston Committee from forcing the matter upon public attention. Learning that they were dissatisfied with the working of the Plan, we suggested to them at any early day the raising of that Committee, saying we "would co-operate with them in the matter," not doubting that such Committee would have fairly adjudicated between us. To this suggestion they did not assent, but in direct disregard of the fifth article of Agreement, and without advising us of their intentions, they proceeded to annul the contract, and now attempt, by criminating us, to justify themselves before the public.

SPECIFIC COMPLAINTS.

Their allegations are :

First. That the clause in the agreement "transfer the sale and agency of its book and tract publi-

cations" to the Society in Boston, *means* a transfer to the Boston Society "of the *business* previously conducted by the New York Society in that city"—in mercantile phrase, "the good will" of that business.

Second. That the stipulated compensation for the sacrifices to which, for the sake of harmony, they consented, had not been rendered.

Third. That it was the "understanding of the Committee who framed that Agreement," that the lease of the Store No. 40 Cornhill should be transferred to the Boston Society.

Fourth. That "we asked that the lease of the Store No. 40, should be transferred to us (them) to secure for ourselves the prestige of their business in this city," and that the New York Secretary made an "express engagement to cheerfully co-operate with us in any arrangement which would suit us," as to the lease of this store.

Fifth. That the expiration of that lease was concealed from them until our late Depositary had taken the lease in his own name.

Sixth. That our Society "suffered him to retain that lease," and gave him aid "to resume the same business which he had carried on as our agent," and wrongfully aided him by advertisements.

Are these Statements of the Boston Executive Committee, upon which the action of that Society in abrogating the Plan was based, sustained by the facts?

We propose to answer this question as to each

allegation and in the order in which it was presented to the Boston Society.

MEANING OF CLAUSE.

First. They allege that the clause in the Agreement "transfer the sale and agency of its book and tract publications" to the Society in Boston *means* a transfer to the Boston Society "of the business previously conducted by the New York Society in that city"—in mercantile phrase "the good will" of that business.

What does that clause of the agreement between the two Societies mean?

It means that the New York Society should transfer to the Boston Society, the agency for making sales, of its book and tract publications in that city; that is—transfer the *sale and agency* from its late Depositary to the Boston Society. Such construction is in harmony with the third article of the agreement, which provides that neither Society shall "be compelled to keep or sell any book or tract, which its own Committee of Publication does not approve."

It does not mean that the New York Society should *SELL* its books and tracts to the Boston Society, nor transfer them *to that Society as a purchaser*, nor that it should transfer "its business previously conducted there" to the Boston Society *except as its agent*; nor was it "a contract for value received" as the Boston Committee argue, "to deliver the *good will*" of that business to their Society. We are not aware that in mercantile transactions a princi-

pal ever delivers the "good will" of his business to his *agent*—manifestly such an idea is not involved in the language of the agreement.

We do not agree with the Boston Committee that the transfer of such good will to their Society was the "sole equivalent for relinquishing the right of personal appeals to the churches," as is averred in their Statement. The object of their agreement to "discontinue all appeals to churches," etc., as provided in the first article, was to relieve churches and ecclesiastical bodies in New England and elsewhere from all conflict of agencies of the Societies in applying for funds; its essential equivalent was the discontinuance of our depository in Boston. They discontinue their collecting agents, we discontinue our depository; and then we *mutually transfer* the agency to each other of selling our book and tract publications, that is, each becomes the Agent of the other in its own city.

This is all that the phrase in itself means. Hence their statement that it *means* transfer of "the business"—the good will of the business—is an error. If the obvious meaning of the words is considered, the Boston Society have no claim to the "good will" of our business in Boston.

COMPENSATION FOR SACRIFICES.

Second. They affirm that the stipulated compensation for the *sacrifices* to which, for the sake of harmony, they consented had not been rendered.

There is a special injustice to us in the charge that we failed to render them the "stipulated com-

“pensation” for the great “sacrifices” they had made.

They had already determined that it was best, in a merely pecuniary view, to withdraw their collecting agents, whether our Depository were discontinued or not. That this was so, there is undoubted proof. In the Annual Report of the Boston Society, page 27, at the meeting which adopted the Plan, the President of their Society, W. A. Booth, Esq., says: “The question was with us [their Executive Committee], whether we should submit that action [the withdrawal of collecting agents] independent of any arrangement with the New York Society. . . . I believe that if we had not taken that course [made an arrangement with the New York Society], we should have come before you at this meeting, and proposed exactly the same thing we now propose—to withdraw all agencies, and rely upon voluntary contributions. . . . I believe every gentleman of the Executive Committee, and so far as I know, all the officers, were of the opinion that that would be the best plan for the Society to adopt, before we reached this arrangement with the New York Committee.” And yet now they claim a great “sacrifice” in doing just what they had determined to do as “the best plan for that Society!”

LEASE OF STORE.

Third. The Boston Executive Committee claim that it was the “understanding of the Committee, who framed the agreement,” that the lease of the

Store No. 40 Cornhill, should be transferred to the Boston Society.

We state as fact within our knowledge, that there was no understanding of the Committee to that effect.

ERRORS OF FACT.

Fourth. The Boston Executive Committee say, "We asked that the lease of the store No. 40 should be transferred to us" (them), "to secure for ourselves the prestige of their business in this city," and that the New York Secretary, in *reply to such request*, made an "express engagement to cheerfully coöperate with us in any arrangement which would suit us," in reference to transferring that lease. They here affirm three things: namely that they asked a transfer of the lease to *themselves*; that they asked it to secure the *prestige of our business*; and that our Secretary in reply expressly engaged to coöperate in securing such transfer, neither of which Statements is true in point of fact.

The letter in which they profess to make such request is as follows:

DEC. 30. "We have long been desirous of hiring the small building next our own (24 Cornhill), now occupied by Messrs. Graves & Young. . . . Mr. Young of that firm called to-day upon me to say, that provided *they* could secure No. 40 Cornhill, they would be willing to release No. 24. I state the matter to you, and inquire if No. 40 is in your control; and if so, if we *may give Graves & Young encouragement* accordingly."

They did not ask for a transfer of the lease to themselves for any purpose—they wanted No. 24—not No. 40 Cornhill; and the answer of our Secretary to that letter had no reference to a transfer to them of No. 40, or of the business which had been previously conducted in that store.

Our Secretary answered:

DEC. 31. "No. 40 is under our control for the present; and *if the proposed plan is perfected*, we will cheerfully coöperate with you in any arrangement of the matter which will suit your friend Mr. Young and you. But we *cannot speak definitely* till the business is more advanced than it is at present."

At no time has our Society or its Secretary made an engagement—either express or implied—to co-operate with the Boston Executive Committee in any arrangement for the transfer of that lease which might suit them: our Secretary in the letter referred to, not only made no such engagement, but expressly refused to speak definitely even as to giving control of the building to Graves & Young, until the proposed Plan of arrangement should be perfected, which plan was not adopted by the Boston Society, until the 12th of February, and by the New York Society until the 13th of May last, and not "perfected" until the details were all arranged.

CONCEALMENT DISPROVED.

Fifth. The Boston Executive Committee allege that the expiration of that lease "was concealed

from" them until our late Depositary had taken a renewal of it in his own name.

To this allegation we are compelled to give our unqualified denial.

Mr. Kemp obtained in his own name from the agent of No. 40 Cornhill, some time in February, the refusal of a lease of those premises; but such fact was not known to any officer of this Society until the 26th day of March. On the 28th of the same month that fact was communicated to the Boston Society by our Secretary in these words: "If you will furnish satisfactory accommodations for us in 28 Cornhill," "we will thereupon, with the consent of Mr. Kemp, *who has the refusal of it*, [not from us,] turn over No. 40 to you." This we communicated to the Boston Society as soon *within a single day* as it was communicated to us. What we knew upon that subject was promptly communicated to the Boston Society.

It was not the duty of our Society to take a renewal of that lease, to be transferred to the Boston Society, nor to notify them of its expiration, as was argued in the Statement of their Executive Committee, for the simple reason that our Society, had not made any engagement to do so. Neither had the Boston Society any right to or interest in the lease or premises.

We are assured that our Secretary never made an "engagement to co-operate with us (them) in any arrangement which would suit us," (them,) as was alleged by that Committee—that the language imputed to him in their statement, was a misquota-

tion of these words, "We will cheerfully co-operate with you in any arrangement *of the matter* which will suit *your friend Mr. Young* and you," contained in his letter of the 31st of December, quoted above. We submit that there has been a direct perversion of this language of our Secretary from the matter in reference to which it was used by him, and that great injustice has been done in the attempt to establish an unfounded charge against this Society by such means.

NOT WRONGFULLY AIDED.

Sixth. It is in no sense true that our Society suffered Mr. Kemp "to retain that lease," or gave him aid "to resume the same business which he had carried on as our agent," or wrongfully aided him by advertisements.

Mr. Kemp resigned his connection with us April 8, and formed a partnership with another gentleman to carry on the book business; and having the lease of No. 40, they opened a bookstore there. The new firm ordered books as others did, and we sold to them in exact accordance with the agreement between the two Executive Committees, mentioned below, both as to discount and as to time. This we had a perfect right to do. Had we refused to do it, they could have procured our books through third parties.

We advertised the new firm as we do other booksellers. In two or three instances where the name of the firm was inadvertently used in catalogues, correction was made the moment it was

pointed out. As it is not pretended that the New York Society, or its officers, had any connection with the use made by him of "cards and circulars," "newspaper advertisements," "old signs and former clerks," or that it could have been prevented by the interference of this Society, we fail to see any object of referring thereto in the statement of the Boston Executive Committee, except to heighten the rhetoric of their narrative.

We have now, briefly as the nature of the case would admit, met the allegations of the Boston Executive Committee, both as to their construction of the clause, "to transfer the sale and agency of its book and tract publications," etc., and the specific charges against this Society which constituted the basis of the action of the Boston Society in rescinding its agreement.

Our answer thus far has been made, assuming for the argument, that no important fact had been withheld from the consideration of the Boston Society, which could properly influence its action in so important a matter as the rupturing of the compact which the two Societies had made.

AGREEMENT OF COMMITTEES.

But the amazing fact in this connection is this— that the Boston Executive Committee concealed from their Society the entire action of the two Committees in reference to the sale and agency of each other's book and tract publications, and omitted to state that they met and unanimously agreed upon *a specific mode of effecting the object of*

that clause, and acted upon that mode from the hour the Plan went into effect.

That the Christian public, to whom the appeal is made, may reach a righteous decision, we specify the *action of the two Committees on whom the execution of the Plan devolved.*

For the purpose of arranging details for working out the Plan proposed, Messrs. Barnes, Kingsbury, Stevenson, Rockwood, and Bradford of the New York Society, met Messrs. Palmer, Smith, Hill, Childs, and Broughton of the Boston Society, February 25, at 28 Cornhill, and conferred upon the whole subject. The first, and a prominent topic of consideration by that Committee, was the sale of the book and tract publications of the two Societies, in the cities of New York and Boston.

A suggestion was made that each Society should have the *exclusive* right in its own city, of purchasing the books and tracts of the other Society. This was rejected. After full consideration, on the suggestion of a member from Boston, it was unanimously agreed, as, in the judgment of the joint Committee, the best means of securing the end intended, that each Society should allow the other "*a special and exceptional discount not allowed to others,*" while each might sell to the trade in Boston, New York, and everywhere, at a specified but less discount.

Having determined this, the Committees went farther, and agreed that "the special and exceptional discount" should be from 40 to 45 per cent. The points left unsettled were, the exact amount of

the special discount and of the discount to the trade. These points were the subject of correspondence, and were definitely arranged April 2d.

AGREEMENT ACTED ON.

In accordance with this agreement, the Boston Committee, April 20th, ordered above \$2,000 worth of our publications, which were shipped to them on the agreed terms of a "special discount." The New York Committee also ordered books from the Boston Society on said terms, which were so invoiced and sent, and both Societies sold to the trade at the agreed trade discount. May 6th, Messrs. Booth, Palmer, Smith, and Means, of the Boston Committee, visited New York, and met Messrs. Barnes, Colgate, Eastman, and Stevenson, of the New York Committee, in final conference, at 150 Nassau-street. The points which had been agreed to February 25, in conference at Boston, and by subsequent correspondence, and acted on by both Committees, were taken up in detail, approved and unanimously voted as follows:

(1.) "That each Society shall give to the other a special and exceptional discount of $42\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AGREEMENT TO TRANSFER THE SALE AND AGENCY TO EACH OTHER IN ITS RESPECTIVE CITY.

(2.) "*That the highest discount to the trade shall be $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent.*"

Four other items were adopted, but were in no way connected with the present matter.

Such was the agreement of the two Executive

Committees to effect the object sought by the clause, "transfer the sale and agency," and such their action in accordance with that agreement.

Both Societies continued to act on this basis till the abrogation. The Boston Committee cannot be allowed at the end of five months of uniform action to go back and question the manner in which the second article has been fulfilled by both.

It is worthy of special note here, that the matters complained of in the statement of the Boston Executive Committee had occurred before this final vote of the two Committees May 6, which would seem to be a bar to their charges against the New York Committee.

OTHER OMISSIONS.

The Boston Committee also omit to state that the New York Society, according to the agreement, discontinued their Depository in Boston, thus retiring from the field as a competing establishment: and that the "transfer of sale and agency," was a *mutual* compact, requiring of them in New York, precisely what was required of us in Boston.

This Depository was an essential element of the Society's work in New England. It was known as its place of business, where its publications were kept to supply individuals, Sabbath-schools, and the trade. It was the home of its Depository, who, by industry and skill and long experience, had secured the good will of the churches of different denominations, and established a business of about \$40,000 per annum—a business which the Society

could only surrender at the sacrifice of thousands of dollars. But the *contract* demanded that the Depository should be discontinued, and it was discontinued April 14th, and the books, having been first offered to the Boston Society, were reshipped to New York. The contract *was fully carried out* in good faith by us.

With these omissions of essential facts, did the Boston Committee present the case fairly to their Society?

OUR FAITHFULNESS PROVED.

We have already shown that by a strict construction of "the terms of agreement," we were not bound to transfer to the Boston Society what is called the "good-will" of our business.

But with this statement of what the Executive Committees agreed to do and *did do* under the Plan, we are prepared to show the faithfulness of the New York Committee in the whole matter; and to show, that in discontinuing our depository in Boston, and giving them a special and exceptional discount over all other purchasers, *we intended to secure to them the benefits of the book trade we had built up in Boston. This we desired, and for this faithfully labored.* So far as they failed to secure that business, they, not we, are responsible.

Three facts prove this.

FIRST PROOF.

When the Special Committees first met, February 25th, to arrange details, and had agreed that

the two Societies should give a special and exceptional discount to each other, as the means of transferring the business, Mr. Kemp had charge of the New York depository in Boston, not yet discontinued. He had been connected with one Society or the other, at different periods, for twenty-one years, was "posted" as to the publications and trade of both, and had built up a prosperous business for the New York Society at No. 40 Cornhill. As that depository was to be discontinued, and the Boston Society was to sell our publications at 28 Cornhill, the New York Committee suggested the employment of Mr. Kemp in the united establishment, as the *natural and sure way to convey the business of the New York Society to the Boston Society*. This, they urged, would promote the interests of both Societies.

When the Boston Committee objected that they could not afford to employ him, the New York Committee *offered to pay half his salary*; but they still declined to give him a place in the united establishment. This the New York Committee regarded then, and do now regard, as the fatal mistake of the Boston Committee as to the business of the store No. 40. Rejecting the man who had the control of the trade, they could not expect to secure it, except so far as they could command it by the special discount agreed upon; and they thus put it out of the power of the New York Committee to secure it fully to them.

Their failure to secure the business, we submit, *was owing to their own act, and against the earnest remonstrances of the New York Committee*.

SECOND PROOF.

Again: the New York Committee desired also to place the building No. 40 at their disposal, to aid them in securing the business in our publications, and were prevented from doing so only *by their own non-action in the matter*, as will now be shown.

Let it be noted, that in the Plan of Agreement the New York Society's *benevolent* work—the collection of donations in New England, the granting of books and tracts, the management of colportage, and the supervision of the periodicals, was not included, and was still to be conducted by the New York Society. For this purpose, the representatives of the Society must have suitable office room in Boston. This they had in No. 40; but if they should relinquish that building, they must secure rooms elsewhere, and they desired to do this in 28 Cornhill with the Boston Society, especially as it was important to present the visible unity of both Societies, carrying on their work under the same roof. Hence, when the Boston Committee expressed a desire to get the control of No. 40, we answered, March 13, “We shall want rooms for conducting our charitable work; what facilities can you furnish us in 28?”

March 17th, we wrote again: “We cannot relinquish No. 40 to any one till we know what accommodations we can have with you or elsewhere for our charitable work. If your Committee, in responding to our letter of the 13th, assure us of satisfactory accommodations at No. 28, we shall then

be prepared to make arrangements for relinquishing No. 40. If not, we must remain there, or find suitable rooms elsewhere."

Once more we wrote, March 28th: "If you will furnish us satisfactory accommodations in your building for our District Secretaries and for our charitable and periodical work under the care of Mr. Kemp, we will thereupon, with the consent of Mr. Kemp, who has the refusal of it, turn over No. 40 to you. We earnestly hope this will meet your approval."

Thus it appears that for weeks No. 40 was offered to the Boston Committee, upon a condition which they could have met at any moment, by specifying suitable rooms for the representatives of the New York Society in their building 28 Cornhill. Why they did not specify rooms for us remains unexplained to this day.

The condition, "with Mr. Kemp's consent," contained in our last letter, became necessary from the fact that the New York Committee had just learned that Mr. Kemp had obtained from the agent, the refusal of No. 40 when we should cease to occupy it. But that action of Mr. Kemp did not prevent us from having the control of the building while Mr. Kemp was in our service, as he was up to this time; and up to this time they could have had it. *Their failure to secure that building was not the fault of the New York Committee.*

THIRD PROOF.

The third evidence of our desire to secure to them the advantages of our trade in Boston, is seen in the fact that we caused to be inserted in the Boston daily and weekly papers as soon as the Plan was fairly in working order, the following advertisement:

“American Tract Society, 150 Nassau-street, New York, and 28 Cornhill, Boston.

“The American Tract Society, New York, has discontinued its Depository at No. 40 Cornhill, Boston, and transferred the Special Agency of its Book and Tract publications to the

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,

28 CORNHILL, BOSTON,

N. BROUGHTON, JR., DEPOSITORY,

where they can be had at the same terms as in New York.

“N. B. N. P. Kemp resigned his position with the American Tract Society, New York, April 8, 1868, which was accepted, to take effect April 14th, and has had no connection with it since.

REV. L. B. ROCKWOOD, SECRETARY.

H. E. SIMMONS, TREASURER.”

If our offer to pay half of Mr. Kemp's salary, that they might have the benefit of his control of our book business—if our repeated offer of No. 40 to them, though bound by no compact to make the offer—if our gratuitous and repeated advertisements of the Boston Society in Boston papers and in the American Messenger, does not prove

our honest and frank desire and determination to transfer our trade to them, so far as in our power, we know not how it could be shown.

We have now met the material allegations of the Boston Committee, and shown their fallaciousness from their own premises; we have shown the plan adopted by the two Executive Committees to secure the end aimed at by the phrase, "transfer the sale and agency," and that both Societies acted on this plan until the compact was annulled; and we have demonstrated the faithfulness of our Committee in the whole matter.

FAILURE EXPLAINED.

This being true, it is a natural inquiry, *Why has the Agreement for harmony failed?*

Is not the frank confession of the Boston Society, "that the basis proved repugnant to the mass of their members," and the course pursued by their Committee, a sufficient answer to this question? That Committee had no part in the formation of the Agreement. It was framed, so far as the Boston Society was concerned, by a Committee of five, appointed by the Society *outside* of the Executive Committee. Had the Conference Committees who framed the Plan retained the control of the matter, we cannot doubt it would have been successfully carried through. But it is well understood that the Executive officers at Boston were dissatisfied with the Plan from the outset. Many of the speakers at the meeting October 1st, in urging the abrogation of the Agreement, exhibited the same feeling, in some

cases intensified into bitterness against the Plan and against the New York Society.

More than this, the Boston Executive Committee did not carry out even the letter of the Agreement. They and we were bound not to give more than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. discount to the trade. In repeated instances they allowed a larger discount. We never did.

Though bound by the agreement, under the clause, "transfer of sale and agency," to transfer the agency for selling their books in New York to us, they made no effort to accomplish it, their former agents in New York to this day selling their publications under the sign, "AGENCY OF THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, BOSTON, INSTITUTED IN 1814."

They have never, so far as we know, advertised our Society as having their publications for sale, or as in any sense their agents.

Though *prohibited by the Agreement* from addressing personal or other appeals to churches or Sabbath-schools, "*by circular or otherwise,*" they have sent over the land circulars containing appeals addressed as follows:

"Rev. ———

or Elder of Presbyterian Church."

And when addressed to a Congregational church, thus:

"Rev. ———

or Deacon of Congregational Church:"

which we submit is *virtually addressing circulars to CHURCHES*. And finally, in violation of the fifth Article of Agreement, they went forward to the

abrogation of the Agreement without giving notice of their purpose, avowedly regardless of "form and technicality."

Will not all this explain the failure?

The New York Committee regret the failure of the Plan, *not* because it was in their judgment the *best*, for they were from the first in favor of ORGANIC UNION, and this they believe the churches wished; but because it was a fair and honest effort on our part to relieve the churches of a double agency to do the Tract work. They earnestly desired its success for the sake of peace and the glory of Christ's cause; and their sincere regret now is, the necessity laid upon them thus in self-defence to state publicly the facts.

But notwithstanding the extraordinary statement of the Boston Executive Committee, and the no less extraordinary abrogation of the Plan by the Boston Society, we feel it our duty, as it is our pleasure, particularly to refer to the courtesy and Christian intercourse which in our interviews so honorably characterized the members of the Conference Committee from Boston, each of whom seemed to vie with us in suggesting and yielding whatever would promote the best interest of the great work in which we were mutually engaged, apparently unconcerned as to which Society would be most benefited.

We wish now to rise above and look beyond this temporary disagreement of good men laboring for the same end, and gladly anticipate the day when true friends of this form of Christian effort will unite in heart and hand and means to fill the land

and the world with the essential truths of the gospel.

Commending this paper to the candid consideration of all fair minds, and girding ourselves anew to our appropriate work, we invoke the continued co-operation and enlarged sympathy of the friends of the American Tract Society.

O. E. WOOD,

CHAIRMAN OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE,

ON THE PART OF THE N. Y. SOCIETY.

TRACT HOUSE, 150 NASSAU-STREET, NEW YORK.